MYSORE POLICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider—(continued)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಒಳಾಡಳಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ, ಈ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ದಿವಸಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕಲಾಯಿತು. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಲೋಪಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ಮೇರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮ್, ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಐಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್ ಇವರ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನಾ ಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಯಾವುಯಾವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಅತ್ಯಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದವೋ ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಹೊರಪಡಿಸಿದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮೊದಲೇ ನಾನು ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ಕಾಪಿಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ; ಈಗ ಅದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲೇ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

1 P. M.

ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾವುವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಸಭೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕವಾಗಿ ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಗಡಿಪ್ರಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳವರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯೇನಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೇವಲ ಪಟ್ಟಣಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅಂಥದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೇ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವಂತೆ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಷನ್ ಒಂದು ನ್ಯೂಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಅಥವಾ ಹಾವಳಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಆವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇನಿದ್ದರೂ ನಗರಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೇ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನೇ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ತ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಮೈಸೂರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಎಲ್ಲ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಸಬೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಸಬೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಹಾಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ದಾವಣಗೆರೆ, ಕೆ. ಜಿ. ಎಫ್. ಮತ್ತು ಭದ್ರಾವತಿ—ಈ ಮೂರು ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂದು ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಹೀಗೆ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಗತ್ಯ ತೋರಿಬಂದಾಗ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಇತರ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಅನ್ವಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಕೈಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಗತ್ಯಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಒಂದು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಜರುಗುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಅಂಥ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕ್ಲಾಜು (2)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 38 (A) ಗೆ ಕೊಚ್ಚಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದರೆ —

"disturbance, discomfort or injury or risk of annoyance." ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು Clause (iii) in sub-section (1) of Section 38 (A) for the word 'risk' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಆ ಶಬ್ದ ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಿವಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಿನ ವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬೆಳಿ ಈಗ ಈ ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪದವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಯಾವುದೆಂದರೆ 'likelihood' ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.—

ಒಂದು ಲೀಗಲ್ ಫ್ರೇಜಿಯಾಲಜಿಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈಗ ಈ 'likelihood' ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಶಬ್ದವಿತ್ತು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈಗ ಈ 'risk' ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿ 'likelihood' ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮದ್ರಾಸು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನಿನಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ನಡೆದು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರೆಗೂ ಹೋಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಡಿಸಿಷನ್‌ಗಳಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಪದವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮ್‌ರವರು ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದುದೆಂದು ನನಗೂ ಹೊಳೆಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ನಾನೀ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಸೇವಿಂಗ್ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನಾನು ಏನೊಂದು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೋ

ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ಕಾರ್ಯಸಿಕ್ಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾಗಬೇಕೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್‌ಅವರು ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ (4) ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆಗಬಾರದ ಅನಾಹುತಗಳಾಗಬಹುದು, ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರತಿದಿನ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಆಹಾರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮುಖ್ಯವೋ ಈ ನಿದ್ರೆಯೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಮುಖ್ಯ. ಜನರಿಗೆ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದಿರಬೇಕು; ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ರಾತ್ರಿ 10ಗಂಟೆಯಾದಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಳಗಾಗುವ ತನಕ ಎಂದರೆ ಬಳಿಗಿನ 6 ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ನಿದ್ರೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಒಂದು ಸದವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೈವದತ್ತವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕು. ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ರಾತ್ರಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ 2 ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ನಿದ್ರೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಕೊಂದರೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಷ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವಿರಾಮ full rest ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಇರಲೇಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ನಿದ್ರೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ತೀರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಆವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾರು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಾದರೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ನ್ಯೂಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಮತ್ತು, ತನ್ಮೂಲಕ ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಿದ್ರಾಭಂಗವಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ರಾತ್ರಿಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮಿಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ 56ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸಿನಿಮಾ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆಡೆ ಅವರು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಶಬ್ದ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ-ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಶಬ್ದ ಮಾತ್ರ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಬರಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಸೌಂಡ್ ಪ್ರೂಫ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೆಂಬ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬಹಳ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚಿಸಿ, ಇದರ ಸಾಧಕಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೇ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ರಾಚಯ್ಯ (ಎಳಂದೂರು ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಇದು ಟೂರಿಂಗ್ ಟಾಕೀಸ್‌ಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.— ಈಗ ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿಗೂ, ನಗರಗಳಿಗೂ ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಇದರ ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಆನಂತರ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಭ್ರಮಣೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಕನಬೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕನಬೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಟೂರಿಂಗ್ ಟಾಕೀಸ್‌ಗಳಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವುದೆ, ಆಗಲಿ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಆದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಏರಿಯಾ ಆಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಟೂರಿಂಗ್ ಟಾಕೀಸ್‌ಗಳು ಹೋದರೆ ಆಗ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ನಗರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಕೆಲವು ಮೂಲ ಭೂತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಥ ಮೂಲ ಭೂತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಿಗನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಸಿಕ್ಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆದ ಚಿಕ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಲು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ತಂದಿರಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ವರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the consideration of the Bill is concerned, if any Hon'ble Member desires to speak he may do so. Then we will take it up clause by clause.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—I want to know in what portion amendments have been effected ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—As and when clauses are taken up for discussion that will be made known. (After a pause) There is no debate.

The question is :

"That the Mysore Police (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses : Clause 2.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I move the following amendment to clause 2 of the original Bill :

"That in clause 2 (i) for the words, figures and letter 'new section 38-A', the words, figures and letters 'new sections 38-A and 38-B' shall be substituted;

(ii) for the words 'the following section', the words 'the following sections' shall be substituted;

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

(iii) in sub-section (1) of section 38-A for the word 'risk' the word 'likelihood' shall be substituted; and

(iv) after section 38-A, the following section shall be added, namely,—

'38-B. *Licensing use of Loud Speakers, etc.*

Subject to the provisions of section 38-A, no person shall use or operate,

(i) in or upon any premises any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond fifty feet from such premises;

(ii) in any open space any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond two hundred feet from the place at which the musical or other sound is produced or reproduced, except under and in accordance with the conditions of a licence granted by the District Superintendent or in such local area by such other officer as the State Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, specify in this behalf'."

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 38-A-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಆ 'Risk' ಎಂಬ ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ, Likelihood ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವ ತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಲೀಗಲ್ ಫ್ರೇಜಿಯಾಲಜಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೇನೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in clause 2.—

(i) for the words, figures and letter 'new section 38-A' the words, figures and letters 'new sections 38-A and 38-B' shall be substituted:

(ii) for the words 'the following section', the words 'the following sections' shall be substituted;

(iii) in sub-section (1) of section 38-A for the word 'risk' the word "likelihood' shall be substituted; and

(iv) after section 38-A, the following section shall be added, namely,—

'38-B. *Licensing use of Loud Speakers, etc.*

Subject to the provisions of section 38-A, no person shall use or operate,—

(i) in or upon any premises any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond fifty feet from such premises;

(ii) in any open space any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond two hundred feet from the place at which the musical or other sound is produced or reproduced, except under and in accordance with the conditions of a licence granted by the District Superintendent or in such local area by such other officer as the State Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, specify in this behalf'."

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಅನಂತರಾಮ್ (ಚಾಮರಾಜಪೇಟೆ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ 'ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರವರು' ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದೇನಾಯಿತೆಂಬುದೇ ತಿಳಿಯುಲಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is also another amendment which will have to be taken up at the end.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—So far as sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A is concerned, my submission is only this: that item (ii) itself will contain the very amendment and the very intention of item (i). Because, item (i) of sub-section (1) of section 38-A says :

"any vocal or instrumental music."

Item (ii) says :

"Sounds caused by the playing, beating, clashing, blowing or use in any manner whatsoever or any instrument, appliance, apparatus or contrivance which is capable of producing sound."

I want to stress that what has already been said in item (ii) is once again re-emphasised in item (i) ; that is unnecessary and superfluous. That is the only amendment I have brought in.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have proposed two amendments in Clause 2.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Yes. My amendments read as follows :

1. "In sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A, the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent or' shall be deleted.

2. "In sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A, item (i) shall be deleted."

So far as the first amendment is concerned, I do not move it as there is another amendment to the same effect by Sri Anantaraman.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Probably he wants the words "any vocal or instrumental music" in item (ii) to be deleted.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I will place the amendment before the House. I move :

"In sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A, item (i) shall be deleted."

I believe what I have got to say so far as this amendment is concerned, I have said.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna).—Now that does not become an amendment to section 38-A (1) ; it becomes an amendment to section 38-B. His amendment is :

"In sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A, item (i) shall be deleted."

It is now 38-B (1) revised according to the proposed amendment.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I feel still it is 38-A (1).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read the Section as amended by you.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—The Section as amended by my amendment reads thus :

"If the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent or any Magistrate of the first class having jurisdiction in any area is satisfied from the report of an officer in charge of a Police Station or other information received by him that it is necessary to do so in order to prevent annoyance, disturbance, discomfort or injury to the public or to any persons who dwell in the vicinity, he may, by a written order issue such direction as he may consider necessary to any person for preventing, prohibiting controlling or regulating the incidence or continuance in or upon any premises or place of sounds caused by the playing, beating, clashing, blowing or use in any manner whatsoever of any instrument, appliance, apparatus or contrivance which is capable of producing sound."

So item (i) will be completely eliminated and there is no necessity for the insertion of this item. The two items more or less convey the same meaning and there is no necessity to retain both of them. It is nothing but redundancy and to that extent the legislation becomes superfluous. I therefore feel that my amendment may be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"In sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 38-A, item (i) shall be deleted."

There is an amendment tabled by Sri Anantaraman.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—Sir, I move :

"In the proposed new section 38-A, the words 'the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent or' shall be deleted and after the words 'any Magistrate of the first class' the words 'or any Magistrate of the second class' shall be inserted."

Why I have brought this amendment is for this reason. The District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent will be given, according to this, judicial power. No doubt, the Hon'ble Minister has said that in the Bombay Act we find the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent at least exercising this power. There in the Presidency towns the police officer is some judicial officer. That is why he is given such power. Whereas in Bangalore he is not a judicial officer. Supposing a subordinate police official files F. I. R. against a certain alleged offender. *Ipso facto* the Superintendent will believe it and thereby it prejudices the case of the alleged offender. It is better the words "the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent" be deleted. The Hon'ble Minister may say that in cases of urgency it will not be possible for the offender or the police officer to approach the First Class Magistrate because he may be in the City or outside the City. In such a case, why not we give more power to the Second Class Magistrate? Even in towns like Davangere and Shimoga, we have got Second Class Magistrates. The Amildar will be there; he is *ex-officio* Second Class Magistrate. Whether *officio* or *ex-ffficio*, the F.I.R. can be field before him. Why I am stressing is, the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent will exercise judicial power. Whatever the subordinate officer informs him, he will believe it automatically and thereby some prejudice will be caused to the people living in cities. In fact, we will experience the difficulty later on. I do not say we do not trust the police superior officers, but there is that trouble. In fact, the offender must be free from this doubt. In the interests of the offender, it is better the judicial power is given to the Second Class Magistrate. There are even revenue officers who will be *ex-officio* Second Class Magistrates. Sometimes Sub-Division Officers also are *ex-officio* First Class Magistrates.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"In the proposed new section 38-A. the words 'the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent or' shall be deleted and after the words 'any Magistrate of the first class' the words 'or any Magistrate of the second class' shall be inserted."

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Here the proposed section provides power for the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent so far as this particular nuisance is concerned. Also the Proviso to the section says :

"The said officer shall afford to the applicant an opportunity of appearing before him either in person or by pleader....."

Here they have also provided that even lawyers may aid the people who have been aggrieved by the order passed by the authorities mentioned in the particular proviso. I for one feel that if the executive officer like the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent is given the particular power and without the influence of the counsel, this would rather be not in conformity with the justice and also equity.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But there is First Class Magistrate also.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Why should there be an alternative? Let them delete the words 'the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent and completely vest power in the Second Class or First Class Magistrate. Because, they say that the applicants or the aggrieved party can be allowed to represent their grievance through counsel. Here the executive officer—the District Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent—is given the power; at the same time the Magistrate is vested with power. There is a lot of confusion and alternative authorities are found here. What I want to stress here is, as Sri Anantaraman puts it, let there be one judicial authority provided so far as the aggrieved party is concerned.

1-30 P.M.

One is an executive officer and the other is a judicial officer. To give the same power to both is rather conflicting. The amendment which I have brought is innocuous and may be accepted. I would say either vest the power solely with the Superintendent of Police or the Assistant Superintendent or the First Class Magistrate or a Second Class Magistrate. Second Class Magistrate because in the rural areas, the Amildar has Second Class Magistrate's powers. In cities the authority may be vested in a First Class Magistrate or Sub-Division Officer. If the authority is vested in the judicial authorities, quick justice will follow. So far as the executive authorities are concerned, they may not be found in one place at the appropriate time. Their work is so extensive and so risky that they may not be found at a particular office. So far as the judicial officers are concerned, they are always at one place and anybody can find them at a proper office and get redress sooner and easier. From this point of view the vesting of power with the executive authority is not desirable. It should be completely vested in the judiciary alone—with the first or second class magistrates. The Bill is more meant for the Urban Areas and not the rural parts. As such, I feel that the aggrieved party will be able to get equitable and justifiable relief and quicker if the powers are vested in the judiciary.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, so far as Sri Linganna's amendment is concerned—I will take up his amendment first—I may confess honestly I have not followed it. Therefore, I would very sincerely request him not to press his amendment for the simple reason that what he....

Sri M. LINGANNA.—That you have not understood it!

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have done what you now propose doing. Probably the amendment that I have lately sent will be taken up to-day. With regard to the amendment that any vocal or instrumental music must be deleted, I should say that it defeats the very purpose with which the Bill is brought forward. You want to take the effect out of it. That I should say is not the idea with which I have brought this Bill. It runs quite counter to the very proposals of the Bill.

Then coming to the amendment my friend Sri Anantaraman has brought, though in principle it may look apparently very convincing or justifiable or that kind of thing, I should say, the real object with which this amendment is brought, is because power has been vested in the police officers. I will explain shortly. It shall also be seen by this House that the power is not given either to a Sub-Inspector or an Inspector of Police. It is given only to a gazetted officer. Sometimes it may happen that the Magistrate is not readily available. You will please see that this is a continuing offence which may happen at any hour of the day or night and there is no question of any concoction of evidence. It is very clear and it is

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

plainly demonstrated by the noise. It is only under these circumstances when the nuisance is actually continuing that the order is given in writing. Therefore, there is no question of any police officer either abusing the power or using the power rather excessively. Normally anything done by the Police is suspicious, but that kind of feeling is not conducive to the well being of Society. In this particular case, what is sought to be prevented is a thing that actually happens and which one can hear. Therefore, under these circumstances, there is no need to delete the words the District Superintendent of Police or the Assistant Superintendent. In Bombay, it is only the Police Officer that is given this power. We are supposing this difficulty in a place where the Magistrate and the D. S. P. are in office—that a man may go to a Magistrate for such an order and on his refusal he may go to the Police Officer and get the same. But that kind of thing is not a possibility.

So far as this law is concerned, concurrent jurisdiction of power is given. Moreover, if any body is harmed by the order, he is not without legal remedy. The very object with which this is brought is to prevent a wrong, a nuisance which is continuing Therefore, the balance of convenience lies in giving the concurrent power both to the Police Officer as well as to the Magistrate, rather than omit the Police Officer altogether. If the Police Officer is omitted, the very object which is now sought to be taken may not be achieved at all. Supposing one continues this offence about 1-00 A.M. or at any time in the night, the Police Officer is there and a man can go and take the order immediately. It may be possible and it may so happen that the Magistrate is not readily available.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—The Magistrate is expected to be on duty all the twenty-four hours of the day—day and night. He is on duty even during night time.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Here is a case where you cannot go in search of an officer for hours and allow this nuisance or mischief to continue. Nothing prevents any body to go to a Magistrate. The remedy with the Magistrate may be better. Nobody is prevented from going and approaching a Magistrate. I assure my friends Sri Linganna and Sri Anantaraman that there is no harm caused to any citizen if this concurrent jurisdiction of power is there. The amendment that I have moved is quite all right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the mover of the amendment say now?

Sri M. LINGANNA.—The Hon'ble Minister said that he could not understand my amendment. I do not want to press. (Laughter). I seek leave of the House to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—I am sure that the Hon'ble Minister will have to come in the next year for this amendment. I seek permission to withdraw the amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in clause 2—

(i) for the words, figures and letter 'new section 38-A', the words, figures and letters 'New sections 38-A and 38-B' shall be substituted;

(ii) for the words "the following section", the words "the following sections" shall be substituted:

(iii) in sub-section (1) of section 38A for the word "risk", the word "likelihood" shall be substituted; and

(iv) after section 38A, the following section shall be added, namely,—

"38B. *Licensing use of Loud Speakers, etc.*—Subject to the provisions of section 38A, no person shall use or operate—

(i) in or upon any premises any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond fifty feet from such premises;

(ii) in any open space any loud speaker or other apparatus for amplifying any musical or other sound, at such pitch or volume as to be audible beyond two hundred feet from the place at which the musical or other sound is produced or reproduced,

except under and in accordance with the conditions of a licence granted by the District Superintendent or in such local area by such other officer as the State Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, specify in this behalf."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 2" as amended stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 3. The question is:

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 4.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I beg to move:

"That in the proposed new clause (*a*) of section 56, between the words "place" and "any" the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

'or occasion other than that of a marriage or religious ceremony'."

Sir, this is a very innocuous amendment. I submit it can be accepted.

ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತಾಚರಣೆಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಆಚರಿಸುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು, ಮದುವೆ ಮುಂಜಿ ಮುಂತಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶುಭಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಓಲಗ ಮುಂತಾದುವನ್ನು ಊದಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬಂಬಾರದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಆಶೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನೊಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in the proposed new clause (*a*) of section 56, between the words "place" and "any" the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

'or occasion other than that of a marriage or religious ceremony'."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣನವರು ಶುಭಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೆತ್ತಿ, ಮದುವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ religious functions ಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಇಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಮತ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮದುವೆ ಆಥವಾ ಇನ್ನೇನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿತರುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದ್ದರೆ, ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. You may kindly see—the prevention of annoyance, nuisance and some of these is the very object with which this Bill is brought.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Any vocal or instrumental music?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If it amounts to annoyance or nuisance. Further ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ 'ಪ್ರಾವಿಷ್' ಇದೆ.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Even with licence, nothing can be played. So far as that is concerned, it is correct. Whay I have said holds good even now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ, (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಗೀತ annoyance ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I regret that it is not possible to accept the amendment of my friend Sri Linganna and I earnestly request him to withdraw it.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I press the amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in the proposed new clause (*a*) of section 56, between words "place" and "any" the following words shall be inserted, namely :—

'or occasion other than that of a marriage or religious ceremony'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 5

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That in the new section 67A—

(i) for the heading, 'Penalty for contravening orders under section 38A', the heading 'Penalty for contravening section 38A or 38B' shall be substituted ; and

(ii) after the words, figures and letter, 'any order under section 38A', the words, figure and letter 'or section 38B or any condition of a licence granted thereunder' shall be inserted."

Sir, this is a consequential amendment that has been brought in view of amendment to clause 2. I pray it may be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in the new section 67-A—

(i) for the heading 'Penalty for contravening orders under section 38-A', the heading 'Penalty for contravening section 38A or 38B' shall be substituted ;

(ii) after the words, figures and letter, 'any order under section 38-A', the words, figures and letter 'or section 38-B or any condition of a licence granted thereunder' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 5, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 6. The question is :

"That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

"That (i) for the heading 'Short Title' the heading 'Short Title and Commencement' shall be substituted ;

(ii) the existing clause shall be renumbered as sub-clause (1) of that clause, and after the clause as so renumbered, the following

sub-clause shall be added, namely :—

'(2) It shall come into force at once in the cities of Bangalore, Mysore and Davangere and in the towns of Kolar, Tumkur, Chitaldrug, Shimoga, Chikmagalur, Hassan and Mandya and in the Kolar Gold Fields Sanitary Board Area and the old and new Towns of Bhadravati ; and it shall come into force in such other areas from such dates as the State Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, specify in this behalf'."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That (i) for the heading 'Short Title' the heading 'Short Title and Commencement' shall be substituted ;

(ii) the existing clause shall be renumbered as sub-clause (1) of that clause, and after the clause as so renumbered, the following sub-clause shall be added, namely :—

'(2) It shall come into force at once in the cities of Bangalore, Mysore and Davangere and in the towns of Kolar, Tumkur, Chitaldrug, Shimoga, Chikmagalur, Hassan and Mandya and in the Kolar Gold Fields Sanitary Board Area and the old and new Towns of Bhadravati ; and it shall come into force in such other areas from such dates as the State Government may, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, specify in this behalf."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"The Clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That the Title and the Pre amble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Police (Amendment) Bill, 1953, as amended, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Police (Amendment) Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE (PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS) INAMS ABOLITION BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯು ಒಂದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಮಸೂದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ನಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇವಾಲಯದ ಇನಾಂತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನುಸಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಂಬತ್ತುನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. 2 ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮದಾಯ ದತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನಿದೆ. ಆಮೇಲೆ Personal Inamthi ಜಮೀನು